

**SUBMITTAL 5**  
**RESPONSE TO COASTAL STAFF**  
**QUESTIONS OF APRIL 30, 2007**

**SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS, RESPONSES & ENCLOSED DOCUMENTATION**

June 8, 2007

<b>SUMMARY - CCC STAFF QUESTIONS FROM APRIL 30TH MEETING</b>	<b>SUMMARY RESPONSE</b>	<b>ENCLOSED RESPONSE DOCUMENT</b>
Has TCA considered Coastal Commission Staff's request for a 1-month extension, pushing the public hearing to October?	➤ Please refer to previous letter dated May 30 <sup>th</sup> , 2007.	None.
Can TCA provide a list of permits and applications submitted to other Federal Agencies?	➤ For your use and information, TCA has enclosed a list of anticipated agency actions.	<b>Item 1: "Foothill Transportation Corridor – South Anticipated Agency Actions."</b>
Some documents included in the March 23 <sup>rd</sup> submittal were designated as 'not for public disclosure.' When can these documents be disclosed?  Can these documents be referenced in the Staff Report?	➤ TCA believes that the Staff Report can be completed without reference to these documents, as all relevant information is available from other documents, copies of which have been provided.  If staff maintains that reference to these documents is necessary, TCA cannot answer the question at this time. TCA requests that this be addressed closer to the time that the Staff Report is prepared. At that time, TCA can make a decision based on the status of the other applications to other agencies. It is possible that, by that time, the documents can be disclosed.	None.
What traffic numbers are available for the segment of I-5 that runs through Camp Pendleton?	➤ Traffic numbers for the portion of I-5 south at the south end of the project study area are presented in the Appendices of the SOCTIIP Traffic and Circulation Technical Report (December 2003). The data for this segment are enclosed.	<b>Item 2: Memo: "Traffic on I-5 South of Orange County/San Diego County Border"</b>

<b>SUMMARY - CCC STAFF QUESTIONS FROM APRIL 30TH MEETING</b>	<b>SUMMARY RESPONSE</b>	<b>ENCLOSED RESPONSE DOCUMENT</b>
Can TCA quantify the water quality benefits of the stormwater system?	➤ Over 1 million gallons of runoff per design water quality storm event from the existing paved areas of I-5 would receive treatment with the FTC-S project. The calculation for this quantification is explained in the enclosed.	<b>Item 3: Memo: “Water Quality Volume Along I-5 to be Treated by the Foothill Transportation Corridor-South Project”</b>
Can TCA clarify between habitat and wetlands creation and restoration by providing a breakdown?	➤ For your use and information, TCA has enclosed a table describing wetland mitigation areas.	<b>Item 4: “Mitigation Area Breakdown”</b>
Can TCA clarify where it used the Coastal Commission’s definition of wetlands? Was it just in the Coastal Zone, or along the entire project?	➤ TCA would like to clarify that the Coastal Commission’s definition of wetlands was used only within the Coastal Zone. CDFG and ACOE wetlands definition was used outside of the Coastal Zone.	None.
Can TCA provide a map of the data points?	➤ An revised set of Jurisdictional Delineation maps have been prepared with all data points.	<b>Item 5: “Revised Jurisdiction Map Set”</b>
What is the timing and nature of the temporary wetlands impacts from falsework and construction?	➤ TCA would like to further discuss a potential falsework concept with Coastal Staff to best address your concerns about temporary impacts.	None.
Can TCA provide more detail on the Pacific pocket mouse barrier wall parameters?	➤ Wall parameters are being developed in conjunction with the USFWS. Details on the wall requirements will be finalized with the completion of the Biological Opinion.  TCA will provide Coastal Staff with the Biological Opinion when it is finalized (expected 3-4 months).	None.
Is there currently any communication between the north and south Pacific pocket mouse populations?	➤ TCA is in agreement with the USFWS that the populations have been bifurcated for some time, and that there is no communication between the populations.  TCA will provide Coastal Staff with the Biological Opinion when it is finalized (expected 3-4 months).	None.

<b>SUMMARY - CCC STAFF QUESTIONS FROM APRIL 30TH MEETING</b>	<b>SUMMARY RESPONSE</b>	<b>ENCLOSED RESPONSE DOCUMENT</b>
Can TCA provide more information about the 'adaptive management' of PPM habitat? How will the habitat be improved?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Details of the Adaptive Management Plan are being developed in conjunction with the USFWS. Details on the management of PPM habitat will be finalized with the completion of the Biological Opinion.</li> <li>TCA will provide Coastal Staff with the Biological Opinion when it is finalized (expected 3-4 months).</li> </ul>	None.
What view impacts will occur from the proposed soundwalls along I-5? Are there any impacts to ocean views? Can TCA provide visual simulations of these views?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ TCA examined the cross sections of I-5 at these locations and determined that there are no existing views of the ocean that will be impacts by construction of the soundwalls.</li> </ul>	<b>Item 6: "Soundwall Cross Sections"</b>
Will the SHPO MOA be completed before the Consistency Certification public hearing? Can TCA provide a copy?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ TCA will provide a copy of the SHPO MOA when finalized.</li> </ul>	None.

SUMMARY - CCC STAFF QUESTIONS FROM APRIL 30TH MEETING	SUMMARY RESPONSE	ENCLOSED RESPONSE DOCUMENT
<p>Which TCA study was in response to the PWA study?</p> <p>Can TCA explain the timing of the different sediment studies?</p> <p>Can TCA explain their reaction to the assertions made in the PWA report?</p>	<p>➤ To avoid confusion and provide you with the most recent information, TCA has updated two sediment transport studies, as well as provided an updated response to the PWA study.</p> <p>TCA asks that Coastal Staff replace those sediment studies provided at the April 30<sup>th</sup> meeting with those enclosed. The versions of the studies provided on April 30<sup>th</sup> were pulled from a file at GeoSoils, and are not dated. They do not represent the official versions of the reports within TCA's files.</p>	<p><b>Item 7: Sediment Transport Memo: "Preliminary Clast (Cobble Fraction) Provenance Study, Lower San Mateo Creek, in Conjunction with the South Orange County Transportation Project, Orange County, California"</b></p> <p><b>Item 8: Sediment Transport Memo: "Additional Discussion of Surfing Resources in the Vicinity of San Mateo Creek and Potential Impacts of the Proposed Toll Road, Orange County, California"</b></p> <p><b>Item 9: Memo: "Updated Evaluation of Philip Williams and Associates Report Entitled, 'Final Report, Potential Toll Road Impacts on San Mateo Creek Watershed Processes, Mouth Morphology and Trestles Surfing Area' dated January 2006"</b></p>
<p>Is the Sediment Memo that was included in Submittal 2 (February 28) in response to the PWA report?</p>	<p>➤ TCA would like to clarify that the sediment memo included in the February 28<sup>th</sup>, 2007 submittal was written in response to a question posed by Staff in our December 5<sup>th</sup>, 2006 meeting with you. The question asked by staff was regarding the size of storm events analyzed in prior sediment analysis.</p> <p>This memo is not intended to respond to the PWA report, or any other prior sediment transport or hydrology analysis. It was intended only to clarify a method of analysis.</p>	<p>None.</p>